arXiv:1601.04000v1 [math.FA] 15 Jan 2016

Isotropic and Dominating Mixed Besov Spaces – a Comparison

Van Kien Nguyen and Winfried Sickel

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Björn Jawerth.

Abstract. We compare Besov spaces with isotropic smoothness with Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness. Necessary and sufficient conditions for continuous embeddings will be given.

1. Introduction

For $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the isotropic Sobolev space $W_2^t(\mathbb{R}^d)$, built on $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is the collection of all functions $f \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|f|W_2^t(\mathbb{R}^d)\| := \sum_{|\bar{\alpha}|\le t} \|D^{\bar{\alpha}} f|L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)\| < \infty\,.$$

The Sobolev space of dominating mixed smoothness $S_2^t W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the tensor product of the univariate Sobolev spaces $W_2^t(\mathbb{R})$, with other words

$$S_2^t W(\mathbb{R}^d) := \Big\{ f \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \|f|S_p^t W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| := \sum_{\|\bar{\alpha}\|_\infty \le t} \|D^{\bar{\alpha}} f|L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)\| < \infty \Big\}.$$

Here $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $|\bar{\alpha}| = \alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_d$ and $\|\bar{\alpha}\|_\infty = \max_{i=1,...,d} |\alpha_i|$. Observe that the mixed derivative $D^{(t,\cdots t)} f$ has the highest order in this norm which is the reason for the name of these spaces. Spaces of dominating mixed smoothness have found applications in approximation theory since the early sixties, more recent in high dimensional approximation and information based complexity, see, e.g., [**32**] and [**19, 20, 21**]. Obviously we have the chain of continuous embeddings

$$W_2^{td}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S_2^t W(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow W_2^t(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Also easy to see is the optimality of these embeddings in various directions. We will discuss this below. These two types of Sobolev spaces $W_2^t(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S_2^t W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ represent particular cases of corresponding scales of Besov spaces, denoted by $B_{p,q}^t(\mathbb{R}^d)$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46E35; Secondary 42B35.

Key words and phrases. distribution spaces, isotropic Sobolev spaces, Sobolev spaces of dominating mixed smoothness, isotropic Besov spaces, Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness, embeddings.

(isotropic smoothness) and $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (dominating mixed smoothness). Indeed, we have

$$W^t_2(\mathbb{R}^d) = B^t_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \text{and} \qquad S^t_2W(\mathbb{R}^d) = S^t_{2,2}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

in the sense of equivalent norms. In this paper we address the question under which conditions on t, p, q the embedding

$$B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \tag{1.1}$$

holds true. In addition we shall discuss the optimality of these embeddings in various directions. Let us mention here that Schmeisser [**23**] and Hansen [**7**] have considered those embeddings as well. Below we will make a more detailed comparison.

Nowadays isotropic Besov spaces represent a well accepted regularity notion in various fields of mathematics. Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness are of increasing importance in approximation theory and information based complexity, we refer to [**32**]. As a special case, the scale $S^t_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ contain the tensor products of the univariate Besov spaces $B^t_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$, see [**27, 28**]. It is the main aim of this paper to give a detailed comparison of these different extensions of univariate Besov spaces into the multi-dimensional situation.

Since a few years there is some strong motivation to study those spaces also for parameters $p, q < 1$. Let $\Phi := (\psi_j)_j$ denote a wavelet basis satisfying some additional smoothness, integrability, and moment conditions. We consider best m-term approximation with respect to Φ, i.e., we investigate the quantity

$$\sigma_m(f,\Phi)_X := \inf\Big\{ \| f - \sum_{j\in\Lambda} c_j\, \psi_j \,|\, X\| :\ |\Lambda| \le m\,,\ c_j \in \mathbb{C}\,,\, j \in \Lambda \Big\}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}_0\,.$$

Associated widths are defined as follows. Let X and Y be quasi-Banach spaces such that $Y \hookrightarrow X$. Then we define

$$\sigma_m(Y,X,\Phi) := \sup\Big\{ \sigma_m(f,\Phi)_X :\quad \| f\,|Y\| \le 1 \Big\}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}_0\,.$$

Usually one concentrates on $X = L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Here we would like to recall the breakthrough result of DeVore, Jawerth and Popov [**5**]. Let $0 < \tau < p$. A function f belongs to the Besov space $B^{d(\frac{1}{\tau}-\frac{1}{p})}_{\tau,\tau}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if, and only if it satisfies

$$\Big(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-1} \Big[m^{\frac{1}{\tau}-\frac{1}{p}}\, \sigma_m(f,\Phi)_{L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \Big]^\tau \Big)^{1/\tau} < \infty\,.$$

Hence, Besov spaces (in particular with $\tau < 1$) describe approximation spaces with respect to nonlinear approximation where the original question (behaviour of $\sigma_m(f,\Phi)_{L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$) has been asked for L_p-spaces with $p \ge 1$. For further results in this directions supporting the importance of spaces with $p, q < 1$, we refer to Jawerth and Milman [**11**], [**12**]. Similar descriptions of $S^{d(\frac{1}{\tau}-\frac{1}{p})}_{\tau,\tau}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ exist as well, see [**8**], [**9**]. For us this motivates the investigation of our problem also for $p, q < 1$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the definition of the spaces $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Our main results are stated in Section 3. Proofs are concentrated in Section 4.

Notation. As usual, $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the natural numbers, $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\mathbb{Z}$ the integers and $\mathbb{R}$ the real numbers, $\mathbb{C}$ refers to the complex numbers. For a real number a we put $a_+ := \max(a, 0)$. If $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, i.e., if $\bar{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d)$, $k_\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\ell = 1, \dots, d$, then we put

$$|\bar{k}| := k_1 + \dots + k_d \,.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we use $\|x\|_\infty := \max_{j=1,\dots d} |x_j|$. The symbols $c, c_1, c_2, \dots, C, C_1, C_2, \dots$ denote positive constants which are independent of the main parameters involved but whose values may differ from line to line. The symbol $A \asymp B$ means that there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that $C_1\, A \le B \le C_2\, A$.
Let X and Y be two quasi-Banach spaces. Then the symbol $X \hookrightarrow Y$ indicates that the embedding is continuous. By $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of compactly supported infinitely differentiable functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ is denoted. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the Schwartz space of all complex-valued rapidly decreasing infinitely differentiable functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The topological dual, the class of tempered distributions, is denoted by $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (equipped with the weak topology). The Fourier transform on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{F}\varphi(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{ix\xi}\, \varphi(x)\, dx \,, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \,.$$

The inverse transformation is denoted by $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$. We use both notations also for the transformations defined on $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
Let $0 < p, q \le \infty$. For an arbitrary countable index set I we put

$$\|(f_k)_{k\in I} | \ell_q(L_p)\| := \Big(\sum_{k\in I} \Big(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f_k(x)|^p \, dx \Big)^{q/p} \Big)^{1/q}$$

(usual modification if $\max(p, q) = \infty$).

2. Besov spaces of isotropic and dominating mixed smoothness

2.1. Isotropic Besov spaces. Usually these spaces are defined by using the modulus of smoothness. Here we prefer to use the Fourier analytic descriptions since we are dealing also with negative smoothness.
Let $\phi_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a non-negative function such that $\phi(x) = 1$ if $|x| \le 1$ and $\phi(x) = 0$ if $|x| \ge \frac{3}{2}$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\phi_j(x) := \phi_0(2^{-j}x) - \phi_0(2^{-j+1}x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \,.$$

This yields

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j(x) = 1 \qquad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \,.$$

We shall call $(\phi_j)_{j=0}^\infty$ a smooth dyadic decomposition of unity.

Definition 2.1. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < p, q \le \infty$. Then $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all $f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^\phi = \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jtq} \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\phi_j \mathcal{F} f](\cdot) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\|^q \Big)^{1/q}$$

is finite (modification if $q = \infty$).

REMARK 2.2. Besov spaces are discussed in various monographs, let us refer to [**3**], [**18**], [**22**] and [**35**]. They are quasi-Banach spaces (Banach spaces if $\min(p,q) \geq 1$) and they do not depend on the chosen generator ϕ_0 of the smooth dyadic decomposition (in the sense of equivalent quasi-norms). We call them isotropic because they are invariant under rotations. Characterizations in terms of differences can be found at various places, see, e.g., [**35**, 2.5] or [**36**, 3.5].

For us it will be convenient to switch to an equivalent quasi-norm. Let $\psi_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\psi_0(x) = 1 \text{ if } \sup_{i=1,\dots,d} |x_i| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_0(x) = 0 \text{ if } \sup_{i=1,\dots,d} |x_i| \geq \frac{3}{2}\,.$$

For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\psi_j(x) := \psi_0(2^{-j}x) - \psi_0(2^{-j+1}x)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Then we have

$$\operatorname{supp}\psi_j \subset \{x : \sup_{i=1,\dots,d} |x_i| \leq 3.2^{j-1}\} \setminus \{x : \sup_{i=1,\dots,d} |x_i| \leq 2^{j-1}\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

As an easy consequence of [**35**, Proposition 2.3.2] one obtains the following.

PROPOSITION 2.3. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < p,q \leq \infty$. Then $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all $f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^\psi = \Big(\sum_{j=0}^\infty 2^{jtq} \big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\psi_j \mathcal{F} f](\cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

is finite (modification if $q = \infty$). The quasi-norms $\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^\psi$ and $\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^\phi$ are equivalent.

In what follows we will work with the $\psi-$norm. Therefore we shall write $\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$ instead of $\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^\psi$.

2.2. Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness. Let $\varphi_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\varphi_0(\xi) = 1$ on $[-1,1]$ and $\operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset [-\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{2}]$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\varphi_j(x) = \varphi_0(2^{-j}x) - \varphi_0(2^{-j+1}x)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{2.2}$$

Hence, $(\varphi_j)_{j=0}^\infty$ forms a smooth dyadic decomposition of unity on $\mathbb{R}$. Now we switch to tensor products. For $\bar{k} = (k_1,...,k_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ the function $\varphi_{\bar{k}}(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined by

$$\varphi_{\bar{k}}(x) := \varphi_{k_1}(x_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \varphi_{k_d}(x_d)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

DEFINITION 2.4. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < p,q \leq \infty$. Then $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all $f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|f|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^\varphi = \Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|tq} \big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F} f](\cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

is finite (modification if $q = \infty$).

REMARK 2.5. (i) Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness are discussed in the monographs Amanov [**1**] and Schmeisser, Triebel [**25**], see also the booklet Vybiral [**38**]. They are quasi-Banach spaces (Banach spaces if $\min(p,q) \geq 1$) and they do not depend on the chosen generator ϕ_0 of the smooth dyadic decomposition (in the sense of equivalent quasi-norms). For characterizations in terms of differences we refer to [**25**, 2.3.4] and [**37**].
(ii) For us of certain importance will be the following observation. Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness have a cross-quasi-norm, i.e., if $f_j \in B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R})\,,\ j = 1,\dots,d$ then

$$f(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} f_j(x_j) \in S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{and} \quad \| f \,|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \| f_j \,|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R})\| \,.$$

(iii) For $d = 1$ we have $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}) = B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R})\,.$

3. The main results

We discuss these embeddings in (1.1) separateley.

3.1. The embedding of dominating mixed spaces into isotropic spaces.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $0 < p,q \leq \infty$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have*

$$S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \tag{3.1}$$

if and only if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- $t > 0$;
- $t = 0$, $0 < p < \infty$ *and* $0 < q \leq \min(p,2)$;
- $t = 0$, $p = \infty$ *and* $q \leq 1$.

REMARK 3.2. Sufficient conditions for embeddings as in (3.1) have been considered by Schmeisser [**23**] and Hansen [**7**]. Both used different methods than we do. Schmeisser used characterizations by differences and concentrated on the Banach space case. Hansen showed $S^{t+\varepsilon}_{p,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ and q_0, q arbitrary by applying wavelet characterizations.

We summarize what is known about the relation of $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in the remaining cases. For subsets X, Y of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we shall call not comparable if

$$X \setminus Y \neq \emptyset \qquad \text{and} \qquad Y \setminus X \neq \emptyset\,.$$

PROPOSITION 3.3. (i) Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$ and $t < 0$. Then we have

$$B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\,.$$

(ii) Let $t = 0$, $p \neq 2$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $\min(2,p) < q < \max(2,p)$. Then $B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable.
(iii) Let $t = 0$, $p = 1$ and $1 < q < \infty$. Then $B^0_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^0_{1,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable.
(iv) Let $t = 0$, $p = \infty$ and $1 < q < \infty$. Then $B^0_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^0_{\infty,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable.
(v) Let $t < 0$, $0 < p < 1$ and $0 < q \leq \infty$. Then $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable.



FIGURE 1.

The embedding (3.1) is optimal in the following sense.

THEOREM 3.4. *Let $0 < p_0, p, q_0, q \le \infty$ and $t_0, t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let p, q and t be fixed. Within all spaces $S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

the class $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the largest one.

REMARK 3.5. Comparing Theorems 3.1 and 3.4 it is natural to ask also for the optimality of $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in the other direction, i.e., we fix $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and look for spaces $B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that (3.1) is true. For this we consider a special situation. Theorem 3.1 yields $S^2_{1,2}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^2_{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. On the other hand, a Sobolev-type embedding and Theorem 3.1 imply

$$S^2_{1,2}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^{3/2}_{2,2}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^{3/2}_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)\,,$$

see the comments at the beginning of Subsection 4.10. But for $d \ge 2$ these isotropic Besov spaces $B^2_{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $B^{3/2}_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable. Hence, an optimality in such a wide sense is not true.

3.2. The embedding of isotropic spaces into dominating mixed spaces.

THEOREM 3.6. *Let $0 < p, q \le \infty$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have*

$$B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \tag{3.2}$$

if and only if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- $t > \max(0, \frac{1}{p} - 1)$;
- $t = 0$, $1 < p \le \infty$ *and* $\max(2, p) \le q \le \infty$;
- $0 < p \le 1$, $t = \frac{1}{p} - 1$ *and* $q = \infty$.

REMARK 3.7. Again we have to refer to Hansen [**7**] for an earlier result in this direction. He proved $S^{td+\varepsilon}_{p,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ and q_0, q arbitrary.

Also in this situation we summarize what is known about the relation of $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in the remaining cases.

PROPOSITION 3.8. (i) Let $0 < p, q \le \infty$ and $t < 0$. Then we have

$$S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\,.$$

(ii) Let $0 < p < 1$, $0 < t < \frac{1}{p} - 1$ and $0 < q \le \infty$. Then $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable.
(iii) Let $0 < p < 1$, $t = 0$ and $0 < q \le p$. Then $S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ follows.
(iv) Let $0 < p < 1$, $t = 0$ and $p < q \le \infty$. Then $B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable.

REMARK 3.9. Obviously the case $t = 0$ is covered by Proposition 3.3. The set $\{(p, 0) : 1 \le p \le \infty\}$ is part of the critical line of (3.2). Also for us it was surprising that the critical line for $0 < p < 1$ is given by $\frac{1}{p} - 1$.



FIGURE 2.

These embeddings are optimal in the following sense.

THEOREM 3.10. *Let $0 < p_0, p, q_0, q \le \infty$ and $t_0, t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let p, q and t be fixed. Within all spaces $B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

the class $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the largest one.

THEOREM 3.11. *Let $0 < p_0, p, q_0, q \le \infty$ and $t_0, t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let p, q and t be fixed. Within all spaces $S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

the class $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the smallest one.

REMARK 3.12. Let us come back to the chain of embeddings

$$W^{td}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) = B^{td}_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_2W(\mathbb{R}^d) = S^t_{2,2}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow W^t_2(\mathbb{R}^d) = B^t_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

discussed in the Introduction. Employing Theorems 3.4, 3.10 and 3.11 we obtain the following optimality assertions.

- Within all spaces $S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow W^t_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the class $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the largest one.
- Within all spaces $B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_2W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the class $B^{td}_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) = W^{td}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the largest one.
- Within all spaces $S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $W^{td}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the class $S^t_2W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the smallest one.

4. Proofs

To prove our main results we will apply essentially four different tools: Fourier multipliers; complex interpolation; assertions on dual spaces; some test functions. In what follows we collect what is needed.

4.1. Fourier multipliers. Let us recall some Fourier multiplier assertions. For a compact subset $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we introduce the notation

$$L_p^{\Omega}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \{f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d) : \ \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{F}f \subset \Omega\,, \ f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\}\,.$$

For those spaces improved convolution inequalities hold, see [**35**, Proposition 1.5.1].

LEMMA 4.1. *Let Ω and Γ be compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $0 < p \le \infty$ and put $u := \min(p,1)$. Then there exists a positive constant c such that*

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1} M \mathcal{F} f | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c\, \|\mathcal{F}^{-1} M | L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|f | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

holds for all $f \in L_p^{\Omega}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and all $\mathcal{F}^{-1}M \in L_u^{\Gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Lemma 4.1 and the homogeneity properties of the Fourier transform yield the following.

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $(\psi_j)_{j=0}^{\infty}$ and $(\varphi_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}$ be the two decompositions of unity defined in* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*, respectively. Let $u = \min(1,p)$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\|\, \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\psi_j \varphi_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F} f)\, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le C\, \|\mathcal{F}^{-1} \varphi_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F} f | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi_{\bar{k}} \psi_j \mathcal{F} f) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le C\, 2^{(jd - |\bar{k}|)(\frac{1}{u}-1)} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1} \psi_j \mathcal{F} f | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \tag{4.2}$$

hold for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ and all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with finite right-hand sides.

PROOF. For $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we put

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\bar{k}} &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x_i| \le 2^{k_i+1},\ i = 1, ..., d\}, \\ \Gamma_j &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sup_{i=1,\dots,d} |x_i| \le 2^{j+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 1. Proof of (4.1). For $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we put $g := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F} f$. Then we have $g \in L_p^{\Omega_{\bar{k}}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g(2^{-j}\cdot) \in L_p^{\Gamma_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j \mathcal{F} g | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= 2^{-\frac{jd}{p}} \|(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j \mathcal{F} g)(2^{-j}\cdot) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\ &= 2^{-\frac{jd}{p}} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big(\psi_j(2^j\cdot)\mathcal{F}[g(2^{-j}\cdot)]\big) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Lemma 4.1 together with $\operatorname{supp} \psi_j(2^j\cdot) \subset \Gamma_0$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j \mathcal{F} g | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &\le c\, 2^{-\frac{jd}{p}} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\psi_1(2\,\cdot))\, | L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|g(2^{-j}\cdot) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\ &\le C \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_0\, | L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|g | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|. \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument yields the estimate of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_0 \mathcal{F} g$. This proves (4.1).
Step 2. To prove (4.2), we put $h := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j \mathcal{F} f$. Then we have $h \in L_p^{\Gamma_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, hence

$h(2^{-j}\cdot) \in L_p^{\Gamma_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In addition we know $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_{\bar{k}}(2^j\cdot) \subset \Gamma_0$. Let $\bar{k} = (k_1, \dots k_d)$ such that $k_1, \dots k_d \neq 0$. Using Lemma 4.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}h|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= 2^{-\frac{jd}{p}}\|(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}h)(2^{-j}\cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&= 2^{-\frac{jd}{p}}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[\varphi_{\bar{k}}(2^j\cdot)\mathcal{F}[h(2^{-j}\cdot)]\big]|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\le c\,2^{-\frac{jd}{p}}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}}(2^j\cdot)]|L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|h(2^{-j}\cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\le c\,\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}}(2^j\cdot)]|L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|h|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

We put $\bar{j} := (j, \dots, j)$. The homogeneity properties of the Fourier transform lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}}(2^j\cdot)]|L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{1}}(2^{-\bar{k}+\bar{j}+\bar{1}}\cdot)]|L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\le c_1\,2^{(jd-|\bar{k}|)(\frac{1}{u}-1)}\,\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{1}}|L_u(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (4.3) we get (4.2) for those $\bar{k}$. An obvious modification yields the estimate for the remaining $\bar{k}$. The proof is complete. □

4.2. Complex interpolation. For the basics of the classical complex interpolation method of Calderón we refer to the original paper [**4**] and the monographs [**2, 3, 16, 34**]. In the meanwhile it is well-known that the complex interpolation method extends to specific quasi-Banach spaces, namely those, which are analytically convex, see [**13**]. Note that any Banach space is analytically convex. The following Proposition, well-known in case of Banach spaces, see [**3**, Theorem 4.1.2], [**16**, Theorem 2.1.6] or [**34**, Theorem 1.10.3.1], can also be extended to the quasi-Banach case, see [**13**].

PROPOSITION 4.3. Let $0 < \Theta < 1$. Let (X_1, Y_1) and (X_2, Y_2) be two compatible couples of quasi-Banach spaces. In addition, let $X_1 + X_2$, $Y_1 + Y_2$ be analytically convex. If T is in $\mathscr{L}(X_1, X_2)$ and in $\mathscr{L}(Y_1, Y_2)$, then the restriction of T to $[X_1, Y_1]_\Theta$ is in $\mathscr{L}([X_1, Y_1]_\Theta, [X_2, Y_2]_\Theta)$ for every Θ. Moreover,

$$\|T : [X_1, Y_1]_\Theta \to [X_2, Y_2]_\Theta\| \le \|T : X_1 \to X_2\|^{1-\Theta}\,\|T : Y_1 \to Y_2\|^{\Theta}.$$

It is not difficult to see that all spaces $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are analytically convex, see [**17**] or [**13**]. By means of Theorem 7.8 in [**13**] and the wavelet characterization of $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$, see [**38**], one can derive that also the spaces $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are analytically convex.

PROPOSITION 4.4. Let $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < p_i, q_i \le \infty$, $i = 1, 2$, and

$$\min\Big(\max(p_1, q_1), \max(p_2, q_2)\Big) < \infty\,.$$

If t_0, p_0 and q_0 are given by

$$\frac{1}{p_0} = \frac{1-\Theta}{p_1} + \frac{\Theta}{p_2}, \qquad \frac{1}{q_0} = \frac{1-\Theta}{q_1} + \frac{\Theta}{q_2}, \qquad t_0 = (1-\Theta)t_1 + \Theta t_2. \tag{4.4}$$

Then

$$B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) = [B^{t_1}_{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d),\, B^{t_2}_{p_2,q_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta$$

and

$$S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = [S^{t_1}_{p_1,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d),\, S^{t_2}_{p_2,q_2}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta.$$

REMARK 4.5. Complex interpolation of isotropic Besov spaces has been studied at various places, we refer to [**3**, Theorem 6.4.5] and [**34**, 2.4.1] as well as to the references given there. The extension to the quasi-Banach case has been done by Mendez and Mitrea [**17**], see also [**13**]. Vybiral [**38**, Theorem 4.6] has proved a corresponding result for sequence spaces associated to Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness. However, these results can be shifted to the level of function spaces by suitable wavelet isomorphisms, see [**38**, Theorem 2.12]. Here we would like to mention that all these extensions of the complex method to the quasi-Banach case in the particular situation of Besov spaces in are based on investigations about corresponding Calderón products, an idea, which goes back to the fundamental paper of Frazier and Jawerth [**6**] (where Triebel-Lizorkin spaces are treated).

Later on we shall need also complex interpolation for some of the remaining cases not covered by Proposition 4.4. Let X be quasi-Banach space of distributions. By $\mathring{X}$ we denote the closure in X of the set of all infinitely differentiable functions f such that $D^\alpha f \in X$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$.

PROPOSITION 4.6. Let $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Theta \in (0,1)$ and $0 < q_i \le \infty$, $i = 1, 2$. If t_0 and q_0 are defined as in (4.4), then

$$\mathring{B}^{t_0}_{\infty,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) = [B^{t_1}_{\infty,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d),\, B^{t_2}_{\infty,q_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\mathring{S}^{t_0}_{\infty,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = [S^{t_1}_{\infty,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d),\, S^{t_2}_{\infty,q_2}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta, \tag{4.6}$$

PROOF. The formula (4.5) is proved in [**39**]. Concerning (4.6) one can argue in a similar way. □

4.3. Dual spaces. Next we will recall some results about the dual spaces of $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For $1 < p < \infty$ the conjugate exponent p' is determined by $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. If $0 < p \le 1$ we put $p' = \infty$ and if $p = \infty$ we put $p' = 1$. For us it will be convenient to switch to the closure of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in these spaces.

DEFINITION 4.7. (i) By $\mathring{B}^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the closure of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
(ii) By $\mathring{S}^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the closure of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Recall that

$$\mathring{B}^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) = B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \max(p,q) < \infty$$

and

$$\mathring{S}^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \max(p,q) < \infty\,.$$

Because of the density of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in these spaces any element of the dual space can be interpreted as an element of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence, a distribution $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ belongs to the dual space $(\mathring{B}^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d))'$ if and only if there exists a positive constant c such that

$$|f(\varphi)| \le c\, \|\varphi|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \qquad \text{holds for all } \ \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Similarly for $\mathring{S}^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

PROPOSITION 4.8. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$.
(i) If $1 \le p < \infty$ and $0 < q \le \infty$, then it holds

$$[\mathring{B}^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)]' = B^{-t}_{p',q'}(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \text{and} \qquad [\mathring{S}^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]' = S^{-t}_{p',q'}B(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

(ii) If $0 < p < 1$ and $0 < q \le \infty$, then

$$[\mathring{B}^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)]' = B^{-t+d(\frac{1}{p}-1)}_{\infty,q'}(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \text{and} \qquad [\mathring{S}^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]' = S^{-t+\frac{1}{p}-1}_{\infty,q'}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

PROOF. The proof in the isotropic case can be found in [**35**, Section 2.11], see in particular Remark 2.11.2/2. For the dominating mixed smoothness we refer to [**7**, Subsection 2.3.8], at least if $0 < p, q < \infty$. Here we only give a proof in case $q = \infty$ for the Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness following essentially the arguments given in [**33**, 2.5.1] for the isotropic case.

Step 1. We shall prove $[\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]' = S^{-t}_{p',1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Substep 1.1. Let $(\varphi_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be the univariate smooth dyadic decomposition of unity used in the definition of the spaces. We put

$$\tilde{\varphi}_j := \varphi_{j-1} + \varphi_j + \varphi_{j+1}\,, \qquad j = 0, 1, \dots\,,$$

with $\varphi_{-1} \equiv 0$. For $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d_0$ we define $\tilde{\varphi}_{\bar{k}} := \tilde{\varphi}_{k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{\varphi}_{k_d}$. With $f \in S^{-t}_{p',1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\psi \in S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|f(\psi)| &= \Big| \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}^d_0} (\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f)(\psi)\Big| = \Big| \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}^d_0} (\mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f)(\psi)\Big| \\
&= \Big| \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}^d_0} (\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f)(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}\psi)\Big| \\
&\le \|2^{-|\bar{k}|t}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|\ell_1(L_{p'})\| \cdot \|2^{|\bar{k}|t}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}\psi|\ell_\infty(L_p)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|2^{|\bar{k}|t}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}\psi|\ell_\infty(L_p)\| &\le \sum_{\|\bar{\ell}\|_\infty\le 1} \|2^{|\bar{k}|t}\mathcal{F}\varphi_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi|\ell_\infty(L_p)\| \\
&\le c\,\|\psi|S^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c > 0$ independent of ψ and f. Consequently

$$|f(\psi)| \le c\,\|f|S^{-t}_{p',1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|\psi|S^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

which means $f \in [\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]'$.

Substep 1.2. Next we prove the reverse direction. We assume that the generator of our smooth dyadic decomposition of unity is an even function. Then $\varphi_{\bar{k}}(-x) = \varphi_{\bar{k}}(x)$ follows for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ an all $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d_0$.

Let $c_0(L_p)$ denote the space of all sequences $(\psi_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}$ of measurable functions such that

$$\lim_{|\bar{k}|\to\infty} \|\,\psi_{\bar{k}}\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = 0$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|\,(\psi_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}\,|c_0(L_p)\| := \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}^d_0} \|\,\psi_{\bar{k}}\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,.$$

Observe that

$$J:\ g \mapsto (2^{|\bar{k}|t}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}g)_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}^d_0}$$

is isometric and bijective if J is considered as a mapping from $\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ onto a closed subspace Y of $c_0(L_p)$. Here we use the fact that

$$\lim_{|\bar{k}|\to\infty} \|\,2^{|\bar{k}|t}\,\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}g\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = 0$$

holds for all $g \in \mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
Let $f \in [\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]'$. Hence, by defining

$$\tilde{f}\Big((\psi_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}\Big) := f\Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{-|\bar{k}|t}\,\psi_{\bar{k}}\Big)\,, \qquad (\psi_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}} \in Y\,,$$

$\tilde{f}$ becomes a linear and continuous functional on Y satisfying $\|\,\tilde{f}\,|Y \to \mathbb{C}\| = \|\,f\,|\,[\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]'\|$. Now, by the Hahn-Banach theorem, there exists a linear and continuous extension of $\tilde{f}$ to a continuous linear functional on the space $c_0(L_p)$. It is known that $[c_0(L_p)]' = \ell_1(L_{p'})$ and any $g \in [c_0(L_p)]'$ can be represented in the form

$$g((\psi_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}) = \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{\bar{k}}(x)\,\psi_{\bar{k}}(x)\,dx\,, \qquad (\psi_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}} \in c_0(L_p)\,, \tag{4.7}$$

where the functions $g_{\bar{k}}$ satisfy

$$\|\,g\,|\ell_1(L_{p'})\| = \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \|g_{\bar{k}}\,|L_{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| < \infty\,,$$

see [**34**, Lemma 1.11.1]. Applying this with $g = \tilde{f}$ we find

$$\|\,(f_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}\,|\ell_1(L_{p'})\| = \|\,\tilde{f}\,|[c_0(L_p)]'\| = \|\,f\,|\,[\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]'\| \tag{4.8}$$

for an appropriate sequence $(f_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}$. In view of (4.7), the definition of $\tilde{f}$, the Plancherel identity and the symmetry condition with respect to $(\varphi_{\bar{k}})$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(\psi) &= f\Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}\psi\Big) = \tilde{f}\Big((2^{|\bar{k}|t}\,\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}\psi)_{\bar{k}}\Big) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|t} \int f_{\bar{k}}(x)\,(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}\psi)(x)\,dx \\ &= \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|t} \int \psi(x)\,(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f_{\bar{k}})(x)\,dx \\ &= \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|t}\,\Big(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f_{\bar{k}}\Big)(\psi) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This leads to the identity

$$\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f = \sum_{\substack{\|\,\bar{\ell}\,\|_\infty \le 1 \\ \ell_j + k_j \ge 0\,,\ j=1,\dots,d}} 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|t}\,\varphi_k\,\varphi_{\bar{\ell}+\bar{k}}\,\mathcal{F}f_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}\,,$$

valid in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Consequently, by using a standard convolution inequality and a homogeneity argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f \,|L_{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\qquad \le \sum_{\substack{\| \bar{\ell} \|_\infty \le 1 \\ \ell_j + k_j \ge 0\,,\ j=1,\dots,d}} 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|t} \,\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_k \,\varphi_{\bar{\ell}+\bar{k}}\, \mathcal{F} f_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}} \,|L_{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\qquad \le \sum_{\substack{\| \bar{\ell} \|_\infty \le 1 \\ \ell_j + k_j \ge 0\,,\ j=1,\dots,d}} 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|t} \,\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_k \,\varphi_{\bar{\ell}+\bar{k}}] \;|L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \|f_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}|L_{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\qquad \le c_1 \sum_{\substack{\| \bar{\ell} \|_\infty \le 1 \\ \ell_j + k_j \ge 0\,,\ j=1,\dots,d}} 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|t} \,\|f_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}|L_{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|
\end{aligned}$$

with c_1 independent of f and $\bar{k}$. Therefore

$$\|f|S^{-t}_{p',1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \;\le\; c_2 \,\|\,(f_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}\,|\ell_1(L_{p'})\|$$

follows. This together with (4.8) proves that

$$\|f|S^{-t}_{p',1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_2 \,\|f|[\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]'\|$$

holds with a constant c_2 independent of f.

Step 2. We shall prove $[\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]' = S^{-t+\frac{1}{p}-1}_{\infty,1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Substep 2.1. The embedding $S^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^{t-\frac{1}{p}+1}_{1,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies

$$\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathring{S}^{t-\frac{1}{p}+1}_{1,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Duality and Step 1 yields

$$S^{-t+\frac{1}{p}-1}_{\infty,1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow [\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]'\,.$$

Substep 2.2. Let $f \in [\mathring{S}^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]'$. Following Hansen [**7**, page 75] we choose a point $x_{\bar{k}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for any $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d_0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le |(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f)(x_{\bar{k}})| \le \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,. \tag{4.9}$$

Then we define the function

$$\psi(x) := \sum_{|\bar{\ell}|\le n} a_{\bar{\ell}}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{\ell}})(x_{\bar{\ell}} - x)\, 2^{|\bar{\ell}|(-t+\frac{1}{p}-1)}\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,.$$

Obviously $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. An easy calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| \psi \,|S^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\quad = \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|t} \Big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}\Big(\sum_{\substack{\| \bar{\ell}\,\|_\infty \le 1 \\ |\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|\le n}} 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|(-t+\frac{1}{p}-1)} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times\, a_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}\, \varphi_{\bar{k}}(\xi)\, \varphi_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}(-\xi)\, e^{-ix_{(\bar{k}+\bar{\ell})}\xi}\Big)(\,\cdot\,) \,\Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\| \\
&\quad \le \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|t} \sum_{\substack{\| \bar{\ell}\,\|_\infty \le 1 \\ |\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|\le n}} \big\| \, 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|(-t+\frac{1}{p}-1)}\, a_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}\, \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}}\varphi_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}(-\cdot)](\,\cdot\,)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \\
&\quad \le c_1 \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|t} \sum_{\substack{\| \bar{\ell}\,\|_\infty \le 1 \\ |\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|\le n}} \big\| \, 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|(-t+\frac{1}{p}-1)}\, a_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}\, \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}(-\cdot)](\,\cdot\,)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of Lemma 4.1 and a homogeneity argument. Observe that

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}(-\cdot)](\,\cdot\,)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|\,\mathcal{F}\varphi_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = 2^{|\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|(1-\frac{1}{p})}\,\|\,\mathcal{F}\varphi_{\bar{1}}\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

if $\bar{k}_i + \bar{\ell}_i \le 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. If $\min(\bar{k}_i + \bar{\ell}_i) = 0$ one has to modify this in an obvious way. Altogether we have found

$$\| \psi \,|S^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_2 \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{\| \bar{\ell}\,\|_\infty \le 1\,,\, |\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}|\le n} |a_{\bar{k}+\bar{\ell}}| \le c_3 \sup_{|\bar{k}|\le 2\,n} |a_{\bar{k}}|\,.$$

This estimate can be used to derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big| \sum_{|\bar{k}|\le n} a_{\bar{k}}\, 2^{|\bar{k}|(-t+\frac{1}{d}-1)} (\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f)(x_{\bar{k}})\Big| &= \Big| \sum_{|\bar{k}|\le n} a_{\bar{k}} 2^{|\bar{k}|(-t+\frac{1}{d}-1)} (f * \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}})(x_{\bar{k}})\Big| \\
&= |f(\psi)| \\
&\le \|f\| \cdot \|\psi|S^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\le c_3\, \|f\| \sup_{|\bar{k}|\le 2n} |a_{\bar{k}}|\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Employing (4.9) and the fact that the $a_{\bar{k}}$ can be chosen as we want, for instance such that

$$a_{\bar{k}}\, (\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f)(x_{\bar{k}}) = |\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f)(x_{\bar{k}})|\,,$$

we find

$$\sum_{|\bar{k}|\le n} 2^{|\bar{k}|(-t+\frac{1}{p}-1)}\, \|\,\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f\,|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_3\,\|f\|\,.$$

Here c_3 is independent of f and n. For $n \to \infty$ we obtain

$$\| \,f\,|S^{-t+\frac{1}{p}-1}_{\infty,1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_3\,\|f\|\,.$$

The proof is complete. □

4.4. Test functions. Let $d \geq 2$. Before we are going to define some test functions we mention a few more properties of our smooth decompositions of unity. As a consequence of the definitions we obtain

$$\varphi_{\bar{k}}(x) = 1 \qquad \text{if} \qquad \frac{3}{4}\, 2^{k_j} \leq x_j \leq 2^{k_j}\,, \qquad j = 1, \dots d\,,$$

if $\min_{j=1,\dots,d} k_j > 0$. In case $\min_{j=1,\dots,d} k_j = 0$ the following statement is true: $\varphi_{\bar{k}}(x) = 1$ if $\frac{3}{4}\, 2^{k_j} \leq x_j \leq 2^{k_j}$ holds for all j such that $k_j = 0$ and $0 \leq x_j \leq 1$ for the remaining components.
Now we switch to $(\psi_\ell)_\ell$. For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ it follows

$$\psi_\ell(x) = 1 \quad \text{on the set} \quad \{x : \sup_{j=1,\dots,d} |x_j| \leq 2^\ell\} \setminus \{x : \sup_{j=1,\dots,d} |x_j| \leq \frac{3}{4}\, 2^\ell\}\,.$$

Example 1. Let $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a function such that $\operatorname{supp} g \in B(0,\epsilon)$ for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough ($0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{8}$) and $|\mathcal{F}^{-1} g(\xi)| > 0$ on $[\pi,\pi]^d$. For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the family of functions f_ℓ by

$$\mathcal{F} f_\ell(\xi) := \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j\, g(\xi_1 - \frac{7}{8} 2^\ell, \xi_2 - \frac{7}{8} 2^j, \xi_3, ..., \xi_d)\,, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d\,, \tag{4.10}$$

where the sequence $(a_j)_{j=1}^\ell$ of complex numbers will be chosen later on. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{supp} g(\cdot - \frac{7}{8} 2^\ell, \cdot - \frac{7}{8} 2^j, \cdot, ..., \cdot) &\subset \{x :\ \varphi_{\bar{k}}(x) = 1, \quad \bar{k} = (\ell, j, 0, ..., 0)\} \\ &\subset \{x :\ \psi_\ell(x) = 1\}\,, \quad j = 1, \dots, \ell\,. \end{aligned}$$

It follows

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\psi_m \mathcal{F} f_\ell] = \delta_{m,\ell}\, f_\ell$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F} f_\ell] = \delta_{\bar{k},(\ell,j,0,\dots,0)}\, a_j\, \mathcal{F}^{-1}[g(\xi_1 - \frac{7}{8} 2^\ell, \xi_2 - \frac{7}{8} 2^j, \xi_3, ..., \xi_d)]\,.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \| f_\ell \,|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= 2^{\ell t} \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\psi_\ell \mathcal{F} f](\cdot) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\| \\ &= 2^{\ell t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j\, \mathcal{F}^{-1}[g(\xi_1 - \frac{7}{8} 2^\ell, \xi_2 - \frac{7}{8} 2^j, \xi_3, ..., \xi_d)] \left| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\| \right. \\ &= 2^{\ell t} \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g(x) \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j\, e^{\frac{7}{8} i (2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)} \Big) \left| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\| \right. \\ &\asymp 2^{\ell t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j\, e^{\frac{7}{8} i (2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)} \left| L_p([-\pi,\pi]^2) \right\| \right. . \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

For the last step we used that $\mathcal{F}^{-1} g$ is rapidly decreasing, $|\mathcal{F}^{-1} g(\xi)| > 0$ on $[\pi,\pi]^d$ and that $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be written as

$$\mathbb{R}^d = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^d} [2m\pi, 2(m+1)\pi)\,.$$

In case $1 < p < \infty$ a Littlewood-Paley characterization of $L_p([-\pi,\pi]^2)$ yields

$$\| f_\ell \, | B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \| \asymp 2^{\ell t} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |a_j|^2 \Big)^{1/2} . \tag{4.12}$$

Similarly

(4.13)

$$\begin{aligned} \| f_\ell \, | S^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \| &= \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jtq} \, \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{(\ell,j,0,\dots,0)} \mathcal{F} f_\ell](\cdot) \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\|^q \Big)^{1/q} \\ &= \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jtq} \, |a_j|^q \, \big\| \, \mathcal{F}^{-1}[g(\xi_1 - \frac{7}{8} 2^\ell, \xi_2 - \frac{7}{8} 2^j, ..., \xi_d)] \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\|^q \Big)^{1/q} \\ &= \big\| \, \mathcal{F}^{-1} g \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\| \, \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jtq} \, |a_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} . \end{aligned}$$

Example 2. In case $p = \infty$ nontrivial periodic functions are contained in $B^t_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{\infty,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. So we can work directly with lacunary series. Let

$$f_\ell(x) := \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j \, e^{i(2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)} , \qquad x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d . \tag{4.14}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\psi_m \mathcal{F} f_\ell] = \delta_{m,\ell} \, f_\ell$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F} f_\ell] = \delta_{\bar{k},(\ell,j,0,\dots,0)} \, a_j \, e^{i(2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)}$$

follow. For $a_j \geq 0$ for all j this will allow us to calculate the quasi-norms in $B^t_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $S^t_{\infty,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We obtain in the first case

$$\begin{aligned} \| f_\ell \, | B^t_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \| &= 2^{\ell t} \, \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\psi_\ell \mathcal{F} f](\cdot) | L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\| \\ &= 2^{\ell t} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j \, e^{i(2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)} \Big| \\ &= 2^{\ell t} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j . \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Concerning the dominating mixed smoothness we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \| f_\ell \, | S^t_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \| &= \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jtq} \, \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{(\ell,j,0,\dots,0)} \mathcal{F} f_\ell](\cdot) \, | L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\|^q \Big)^{1/q} \\ &= \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jtq} \, |a_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} . \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Example 3. Let us consider a function $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\operatorname{supp} g \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 3/2 \le |x| \le 2\}$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ we define

$$g_j(t) = g(2^{-j+1}t) \quad \text{and} \quad g_{\bar{k}}(x) = g_{k_1}(x_1) \cdots g_{k_d}(x_d)\,, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,.$$

Let

$$\nabla_\ell := \{\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d,\ |\bar{k}|_\infty = \ell\}\,, \qquad \ell \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

Then, if $\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell$, we have

$$\operatorname{supp} g_{\bar{k}} \subset \{x :\ \varphi_{\bar{k}}(x) = 1\} \subset \{x :\ \psi_\ell(x) = 1\}.$$

We define the family of test functions

$$f_\ell = \sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} a_{\bar{k}}\, \mathcal{F}^{-1} g_{\bar{k}}\,, \qquad \ell \in \mathbb{N}^d\,.$$

The coefficients $(a_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k}}$ will be chosen later on. By construction we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|f_\ell | S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F} f_\ell](\cdot) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\|^q \Big)^{1/q} \\ &= \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} |a_{\bar{k}}|^q \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g_{\bar{k}} \big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\|^q \Big)^{1/q}.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g_{\bar{k}} \big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\| = 2^{(|\bar{k}|-d)(1-\frac{1}{p})} \, \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g_{\bar{1}} \big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\| = C\, 2^{|\bar{k}|(1-\frac{1}{p})}$$

for an appropriate $C > 0$ (independent of ℓ). Consequently we obtain

$$\|f_\ell | S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \ = \ C \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} |a_{\bar{k}}|^q\, 2^{|\bar{k}|(1-\frac{1}{p})q} \Big)^{1/q}, \qquad \ell \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

Next we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\|f_\ell | B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= \Big(\sum_{j=0}^\infty \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\psi_j \mathcal{F} f_\ell](\cdot) | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\|^q \Big)^{1/q} \\ &= \Big\| \sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} a_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F}^{-1} g_{\bar{k}} | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \Big\|.\end{aligned}$$

Recall, for $0 < p_0 < p < p_1 < \infty$ we have

$$S^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{p}}_{p_0,p} B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^0_{p,2} F(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^{\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p}}_{p_1,p} B(\mathbb{R}^d)\,,$$

see [**10**], and $S^0_{p,2}F(\mathbb{R}^d) = L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 < p < \infty$, see [**15**]. These arguments lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} a_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{F}^{-1} g_{\bar{k}} | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \Big\| &\le C_1 \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{p})p} |a_{\bar{k}}|^p \| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g_{\bar{k}} | L_{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \|^p \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= C_2 \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{p})p} |a_{\bar{k}}|^p 2^{|\bar{k}|(1-\frac{1}{p_0})p} \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= C_2 \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \nabla_\ell} |a_{\bar{k}}|^p 2^{|\bar{k}|(1-\frac{1}{p})p} \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$\Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\nabla_\ell} 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p})p}|a_{\bar{k}}|^p\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}g_{\bar{k}}|L_{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} = C_3\Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\nabla_\ell}|a_{\bar{k}}|^p 2^{|\bar{k}|(1-\frac{1}{p})p}\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$
$$\le C_4\Big\|\sum_{\bar{k}\in\nabla_\ell} a_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}^{-1}g_{\bar{k}}|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|\,.$$

Altogether we have proved in case $1<p<\infty$

$$\|f_\ell|B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\nabla_\ell}|a_{\bar{k}}|^p 2^{|\bar{k}|(1-\frac{1}{p})p}\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where the positive constants behind $\asymp$ do not depend on $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$.

Example 4. We consider the same basic functions $g_{\bar{k}}$ as in Example 3. This time we define

$$f_\ell := \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j\,\mathcal{F}^{-1}g_{\bar{j}}\,,\qquad \bar{j}:=(j,1,\cdots,1)\,.$$

As above we conclude

$$\|f_\ell|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{tjq}|a_j|^q\big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}g_{\bar{j}_0}\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$
$$= C\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{j(t+1-\frac{1}{p})q}|a_j|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

and

$$\|f_\ell|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = C\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{j(t+1-\frac{1}{p})q}|a_j|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

for an appropriate positive constant C (independent of ℓ). Notice that we do not need the restriction $1<p<\infty$ here. It is true for all p.

Example 5. This will be one more modification of Example 3. Let $g_{\bar{k}}$ be defined as there. We put

$$f_\ell := \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j\,\mathcal{F}^{-1}g_{\bar{j}}\qquad \bar{j}=(j,\cdots,j)\,.$$

Then we have

$$\|f_\ell|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{tdjq}|a_j|^q\big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}g_{\bar{j}}\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$
$$= C\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jd(t+1-\frac{1}{p})q}|a_j|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

and

$$\|f_\ell|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = C\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jd(\frac{t}{d}+1-\frac{1}{p})q}|a_j|^q\Big)^{1/q},$$

where C is as in Example 4. Also here the restriction $1 < p < \infty$ is not needed.

Example 6. This example is taken from [**35**, 2.3.9]. Let $\varrho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a function such that $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{F}\varrho \subset \{\xi : |\xi| \le 1\}$. We define

$$h_j(x) := \varrho(2^{-j}x)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

For all p, q, t we conclude

$$\| h_j \, | B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \| = \| h_j \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \| = 2^{jd/p} \, \| \varrho \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \|\,, \qquad j \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

Similarly, also for all p, q, t, we obtain

$$\| h_j \, | S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \| = \| h_j \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \| = 2^{jd/p} \, \| \varrho \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \|\,, \qquad j \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

As an immediate consequence of these two identities we get the following.

LEMMA 4.9. *Let $0 < p_0, p_1, q_0, q_1 \le \infty$ and $t_0, t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$.*
(i) *An embedding $S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^{t_1}_{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies $p_0 \le p_1$.*
(ii) *An embedding $B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^{t_1}_{p_1,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies $p_0 \le p_1$.*

4.5. Proof of Theorem 3.1 – sufficiency. *Step 1.* Preparations. For $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ we define

$$\square_{\bar{k}} := \{j \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \quad \operatorname{supp} \psi_j \cap \operatorname{supp} \varphi_{\bar{k}} \neq \emptyset\}$$

and $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\Delta_j := \{\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : \quad \operatorname{supp} \psi_j \cap \operatorname{supp} \varphi_{\bar{k}} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The condition $\operatorname{supp} \psi_j \cap \operatorname{supp} \varphi_{\bar{k}} \neq \emptyset$ implies

$$\max_{i=1,\dots,d} k_i - 1 \le j \le \max_{i=1,\dots,d} k_i + 1. \tag{4.17}$$

Consequently we obtain

$$|\square_{\bar{k}}| \asymp 1\,, \quad \bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \qquad \text{and} \qquad |\Delta_j| \asymp (1+j)^{d-1}\,, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_0\,. \tag{4.18}$$

By definition we have

$$\psi_j(x) = \sum_{\bar{k} \in \Delta_j} \varphi_{\bar{k}}(x)\psi_j(x)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,. \tag{4.19}$$

Step 2. Let $t > 0$ and let $u = \min(1, p)$. Employing (4.19) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jtq} \Big\| \sum_{\bar{k} \in \Delta_j} \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \Big\|^q \\ &\le \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jtq} \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \Delta_j} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^u \Big)^{q/u}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.1) it follows

$$\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \le C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Big(\sum_{\bar{k} \in \Delta_j} \Big[2^{(j-|\bar{k}|)t} 2^{|\bar{k}|t} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \Big]^u \Big)^{q/u}. \tag{4.20}$$

If $\frac{q}{u} \le 1$ then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q &\le C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\bar{k}\in\Delta_j} 2^{(j-|\bar{k}|)tq} 2^{|\bar{k}|tq} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \\
&\le c_1 \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{j\in\square_{\bar{k}}} 2^{|\bar{k}|tq} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}
$$

The last inequality is due to $2^{(j-|\bar{k}|)tq} \le c_2$ since $t>0$ and $j-1 \le \max_{i=1,\dots,d} k_i \le j+1$, see (4.17). In the case $\frac{q}{u}>1$ we use Hölder's inequality with $1=\frac{u}{q}+(1-\frac{u}{q})$. (4.20) implies

$$
\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \le C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\bar{k}\in\Delta_j} 2^{|\bar{k}|tq} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\Delta_j} \big[2^{(j-|\bar{k}|)t}\big]^{\frac{q}{q-u}} \Big)^{\frac{q-u}{u}} .
$$

Observe, for $t>0$ we have

$$
\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0} \Big(\sum_{\bar{k}\in\Delta_j} \big[2^{(j-|\bar{k}|)t}\big]^{\frac{q}{q-u}} \Big)^{\frac{q-u}{u}} < \infty ,
$$

see (4.17). Hence

$$
\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \le c_3 \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{j\in\square_{\bar{k}}} 2^{|\bar{k}|tq} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q . \tag{4.22}
$$

Finally, from (4.21), (4.22) together with $\square_{\bar{k}} \asymp 1$ we conclude

$$
\|f|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \le c_4 \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|tq} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q .
$$

This proves (3.1).

Step 3. Let $t=0$.

Substep 3.1. First we assume that $q \le \min(p,1)$. From (4.20) with $t=0$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|f|B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q &\le c_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\bar{k}\in\Delta_j} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \\
&= c_1 \sum_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{j\in\square_{\bar{k}}} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\square_{\bar{k}} \asymp 1$ we obtain

$$
\|f|B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \le c_2 \, \|f|S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q .
$$

Substep 3.2. Let $1<p<\infty$ and $0<q\le\min(2,p)$. Our main tool will be the following Littlewood-Paley assertion. With $1<p<\infty$ there exist positive constants A, B such that

$$
A \, \| \, f \, |L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} |\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \Big\| \le B \, \| \, f \, |L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \tag{4.23}
$$

holds for all $f\in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, see Lizorkin [**14, 15**] or Nikol'skij [**18**, 1.5.6]. This will be applied to f replaced by $\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f$. We proceed as in Step 1. Employing (4.19)

and (4.23) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\|f|B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q &= \sum_{j=0}^\infty \Big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f\Big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|^q \\ &\le \frac{1}{A^q}\sum_{j=0}^\infty \Big\|\Big(\sum_{\bar k\in\Delta_j}|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar k}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|^q.\end{aligned}$$

Because of $\|\cdot\,|L_p(\ell_2)\|\le\|\cdot\,|\ell_{\min(2,p)}(L_p)\|\le\|\cdot\,|\ell_q(L_p)\|$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|f|B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q &\le \frac{1}{A^q}\sum_{j=0}^\infty\sum_{\bar k\in\Delta_j}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar k}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \\ &\le c\sum_{j=0}^\infty\sum_{\bar k\in\Delta_j}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar k}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last step (4.1). As in Step 1 we can continue the estimate by changing the order of summation and using $|\square_{\bar k}|\asymp 1$. □

4.6. Proof of Theorem 3.6 – sufficiency. *Step 1.* Let us prove (3.2) in case $t>\max(0,\frac1p-1)$. We put $u:=\min(1,p)$. From we have

$$\varphi_{\bar k}(x)=\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar k}}\psi_j(x)\varphi_{\bar k}(x)\,,\qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^d\,. \tag{4.24}$$

This identity yields

$$\|f|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \;=\; \sum_{\bar k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}2^{|\bar k|tq}\Big\|\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar k}}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\varphi_{\bar k}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|^q.$$

Applying $|a+b|^u\le a^u+b^u$ and (4.2) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\|f|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q &\le \sum_{\bar k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}2^{|\bar k|tq}\Big(\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar k}}\big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\varphi_{\bar k}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^u\Big)^{q/u} \\ &\le C\sum_{\bar k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}2^{|\bar k|tq}\Big(\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar k}}\big(2^{(jd-|\bar k|)(\frac1u-1)}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\big)^u\Big)^{q/u}.\end{aligned}$$

Because of (4.18) this implies

$$\|f|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \;\le\; c\sum_{\bar k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar k}}2^{|\bar k|tq}2^{(jd-|\bar k|)(\frac1u-1)q}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q\,.$$

Consequently

$$\|f|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \;\le\; c\sum_{j=0}^\infty 2^{jdtq}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q\sum_{\bar k\in\Delta_j}2^{(jd-|\bar k|)(\frac1u-1-t)q}\,.$$

It is easily derived from (4.17) and the restriction $t>\frac1u-1$ that

$$\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}\sum_{\bar k\in\Delta_j}2^{(jd-|\bar k|)(\frac1u-1-t)q}<\infty\,.$$

Hence

$$\|f|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q \;\le\; c_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jdtq}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^q$$

follows.
Step 3. Let $t = 0$, $1 < p \le \infty$ and $\max(2,p) \le q \le \infty$. We shall argue by duality. We have

$$S^0_{p',q'}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p',q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)\,,$$

see Theorem 3.1. 4.8(i) can be used to prove the claim.
Step 4. Let $0 < p \le 1$, $t = \frac{1}{p} - 1$ and $q = \infty$. Applying (4.24) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\|f|S^{\frac{1}{p}-1}_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p}-1)}\,\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\ &= \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p}-1)}\Big\|\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar{k}}}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|.\end{aligned}$$

Making use of (4.2), this implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|f|S^{\frac{1}{p}-1}_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p &\le \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p}-1)p}\Big(\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar{k}}}\big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\varphi_{\bar{k}}\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p\Big) \\ &\le c_1 \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p}-1)p}\Big(\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar{k}}} 2^{(jd-|\bar{k}|)(\frac{1}{p}-1)p}\,\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big) \\ &= c_1 \sup_{\bar{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}\Big(\sum_{j\in\square_{\bar{k}}} 2^{jd(\frac{1}{p}-1)p}\,\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (4.18), we obtain

$$\|f|S^{\frac{1}{p}-1}_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \;\le\; c_2 \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0} 2^{jd(\frac{1}{p}-1)}\,\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\psi_j\mathcal{F}f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,.$$

The proof is complete. □

4.7. Proof of Theorem 3.1 – necessity.

LEMMA 4.10. (i) *Let $0 < p < \infty$ and $0 < q \le \infty$. Then the embedding*

$$S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \textit{implies} \qquad q \le \min(2,p).$$

(ii) *Let $0 < q \le \infty$. Then the embedding*

$$S^0_{\infty,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \textit{implies} \qquad q \le 1.$$

PROOF. *Step 1.* We prove (i).
Substep 1.1. We show necessity of $q \le 2$. Temporarily we assume $1 < p < \infty$. We use our test functions from Example 1, see (4.10). The embedding $S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies the existence of a constant c such that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}|a_j|^2\Big)^{1/2} \asymp \|\,f_\ell\,|B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c\,\|\,f_\ell\,|S^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}|a_j|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

where c does not depend on ℓ and $(a_j)_j$, see (4.12) and (4.13). This requires $q \le 2$. Now we turn to $0 < p \le 1$. Again we shall work with Example 1. For any such p there exists some real number $\Theta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\frac{2}{3} = \frac{1-\Theta}{p} + \frac{\Theta}{2}\,.$$

Lyapunov's inequality

$$\| h \,|L_{3/2}([-\pi,\pi]^2)\| \le \| h \,|L_p([-\pi,\pi]^2)\|^{1-\Theta} \, \| h \,|L_2([-\pi,\pi]^2)\|^{\Theta}\,,$$

valid for all $h \in L_p([-\pi,\pi]^2) \cap L_2([-\pi,\pi]^2)$, in combination with the Littlewood-Paley characterization of $L_{3/2}$ and L_2, leads us to

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |a_j|^2\Big)^{1/2} \le c \Big\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j \, e^{\frac{7}{8} i (2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)} \Big| L_p([-\pi,\pi]^2)\Big\|^{1-\Theta} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |a_j|^2\Big)^{\Theta/2}$$

with c independent of ℓ and $(a_j)_j$. Hence

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |a_j|^2\Big)^{1/2} \le c \Big\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j \, e^{\frac{7}{8} i (2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)} \Big| L_p([-\pi,\pi]^2)\Big\|\,.$$

Taking into account (4.11) we can argue as in case $1 < p < \infty$.

Substep 1.2. We show necessity of $q \le p$. Therefore we use Example 3. In case $1 < p < \infty$ we choose $a_{\bar{k}} = 2^{|\bar{k}|(\frac{1}{p}-1)}$. Then almost immediately we can conclude $q \le p$.

Now we turn to the remaining cases. Assume that there exist $0 < p \le 1$ and $p < q \le 2$ such that

$$S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\,.$$

In this situation we may choose a triple (p_1, q_1, Θ) such that

$$1 < p_1 < q_1 \le 2, \quad \Theta \in (0,1), \quad \frac{1}{p_1} = \frac{\Theta}{p} + \frac{1-\Theta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{\Theta}{q} + \frac{1-\Theta}{2}.$$

Then it follows from Proposition 4.4 that

$$S^0_{p_1,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = [S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d), S^0_{2,2}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta$$

and

$$B^0_{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) = [B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d), B^0_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta.$$

Proposition 4.3 yields

$$S^0_{p_1,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

But this is a contradiction to Example 3.

Step 2. To prove (iii) we use Example 2, see (4.14). The embedding $S^0_{\infty,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies the existence of a constant c such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |a_j| = \| f_\ell \,|B^0_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c \,\| f_\ell \,|S^0_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |a_j|^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

where c does not depend on ℓ and $(a_j)_j$, see (4.15) and (4.16). Choosing $a_j = 1$ it is obvious that this can happen only if $q \le 1$. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. *Step 1.* Let $t = 0$. Then the necessity of $q \le \min(p, 2)$ if $p < \infty$ and of $q \le 1$ if $p = \infty$ follows from Lemma 4.10.
Step 2. It remains to deal with $t < 0$. We shall employ complex interpolation.
Substep 2.1. We assume that $0 < p < \infty$ and $1 < q < \infty$. Let $\Theta = 1/2$. From Proposition 4.4 we obtain

$$B^0_{p,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) = [B^{-t}_{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d),\, B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta$$

and

$$S^0_{p,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = [S^{-t}_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d),\, S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta, \qquad \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{1}{2q}\,.$$

Theorem 3.1 and the assumption $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ lead to the conclusion $S^0_{p,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In view of Lemma 4.10 this embedding implies $2q = q_1 \le \min(p, 2)$. This is a contradiction.
Substep 2.2. Let $0 < p < \infty$ and $q = \infty$. This time we use

$$B^0_{p,4}(\mathbb{R}^d) = [B^{-t}_{p,2}(\mathbb{R}^d),\, B^t_{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta$$

and

$$S^0_{p,4}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = [S^{-t}_{p,2}B(\mathbb{R}^d),\, S^t_{p,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta.$$

Here $\Theta = 1/2$. Now Proposition 4.3 implies $S^0_{p,4}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p,4}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This contradicts Theorem 3.1.
Substep 2.3. Let $0 < p < \infty$ and $0 < q \le 1$. We argue as in the previous step. Therefore we shall use

$$B^0_{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) = [B^s_{\infty,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d),\, B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta$$

and

$$S^0_{p_1,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = [S^s_{\infty,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d),\, S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta,$$

where we need $(1-\Theta)s + \Theta t = 0$,

$$\frac{1}{p_1} = \frac{\Theta}{p} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{\Theta}{q}\,.$$

By choosing Θ small we arrive at $q_1 > 2$. This contradicts Lemma 4.10.
Substep 2.4. We assume that $p = \infty$ and $0 < q \le \infty$. Proposition 4.6 yields

$$\mathring{B}^0_{\infty,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) = [B^s_{\infty,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d),\, B^t_{\infty,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta$$

and

$$\mathring{S}^0_{\infty,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) = [S^s_{\infty,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d),\, S^t_{\infty,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)]_\Theta,$$

where $(1-\Theta)s + \Theta t = 0$ and $\frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{\Theta}{q}$. We choose Θ small enough such that $q_1 > 1$. Then, as a conclusion of Theorem 3.1 and Propositions 4.3, 4.4, we get $\mathring{S}^0_{\infty,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathring{B}^0_{\infty,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Now we argue as in Step 3 of the proof of Lemma 4.10 by taking into account that our test functions from Example 2 are elements of $\mathring{B}^0_{\infty,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathring{S}^0_{\infty,q_1}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. □

4.8. Proof of Theorem 3.6 – necessity. By means of the same arguments as used in proof of Lemma 4.10 the following dual assertion can be proved.

LEMMA 4.11. *Let $1 < p \le \infty$ and $0 < q \le \infty$. Then the embedding*

$$B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \textit{implies} \qquad q \ge \max(p,2).$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.6. Step 1. Let $0 < p \le 1$ and $t = \frac{1}{p} - 1$. Assume that there is some $q < \infty$ such that $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ holds. Then Proposition 4.8 yields $S^0_{\infty,q'}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{\infty,q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In view of Lemma 4.10 this implies $q' \le 1$, hence $q = \infty$.
Step 2. The necessity of the restrictions in case $t = 0$ follows by Lemma 4.11.
Step 3. It remains to deal with $t < \max(0, \frac{1}{p} - 1)$.
Step 3.1. Let $0 < p \le \infty$ and $t < 0$. We employ the test functions from Example 1. Choosing $a_j = \delta_{j,\ell}$ in (4.10), we find

$$\| f_\ell \, | B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \| = 2^{\ell t d} \, \| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \| \tag{4.25}$$

and

$$\| f_\ell \, | S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \| = 2^{\ell t} \, \| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g \, | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \| \,, \tag{4.26}$$

see (4.11) and (4.13). With $\ell \to \infty$ it becomes clear that

$$B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

can not hold.
Step 3.2. Let $0 < p < 1$ and $0 \le t < \frac{1}{p} - 1$. We assume $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Proposition 4.8 yields

$$S^{-t+\frac{1}{p}-1}_{\infty,q'}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^{d(-t+\frac{1}{p}-1)}_{\infty,q'}(\mathbb{R}^d) \,.$$

Since $d(-t + \frac{1}{p} - 1) > -t + \frac{1}{p} - 1$ it is enough to use $g_k(x) := e^{ikx}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, as test functions to disprove this embedding. □

4.9. Proof of Propositions 3.3, 3.8. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.3. Part (i) in case $1 \le q \le \infty$ follows by duality from Theorem 3.1, see Proposition 4.8. To cover also the cases $0 < q < 1$ we argue as in proof of Theorem 3.6 (sufficiency) replacing $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $B^t_{p,q}$. Observe in this connection that

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\bar{k} \in \Delta_j} 2^{(|\bar{k}| - j)tq} < \infty \,.$$

Parts (ii)-(iv) are immediate consequences of Theorems 3.1, 3.6.
Now we turn to the proof of (v). Theorem 3.1 yields $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \not\hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It remains to prove $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \not\hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Therefore we employ Example 1 with $a_j := 2^{-jt}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. From (4.11) it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \| f_\ell \, | B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \| &\le c \, 2^{\ell t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j \, e^{\frac{7}{8} i (2^\ell x_1 + 2^j x_2)} \, \Big| L_p([-\pi,\pi]^2) \right\| \\ &\le c 2^{\ell t} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |a_j|^p \Big)^{1/p} \asymp 1 \,. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, (4.13) yields

$$\| f_\ell \,|S^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \big\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} g \,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{jtq} \,|a_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \asymp \ell^{1/q} \,.$$

If we assume $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $q < \infty$, then this leads to a contradiction. In case $q = \infty$ we employ the same type of argument but choose $a_j := 2^{-jt} j^{-1}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.8. To prove (i) we follow the arguments used in proof of Theorem 3.1 (sufficiency) by replacing $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
Concerning (ii)-(iv), observe that $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \not\hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ follows from Theorem 3.6. Now we split our investigations into two cases: $0 < t < \frac{1}{p} - 1$, $t = 0$.
Step 1. Let $0 < p < 1$ and $0 < t < \frac{1}{p} - 1$. $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \not\hookrightarrow B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ follows from Example 1 with $a_j := \delta_{j,\ell}$, see (4.25) and (4.26).
Step 2. Let $0 < p < 1$ and $t = 0$. Theorem 3.1 yields

$$S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad 0 < q \le p \,.$$

Hence, in case $q > p$ the spaces $S^0_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $B^0_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are not comparable. □

4.10. Proofs of the optimality assertions. First we recall some well-known results about embeddings of Besov spaces. Let $0 < p \le p_0 \le \infty$. Then $B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ holds if and only if either

$$t_0 - \frac{d}{p_0} < t - \frac{d}{p} \qquad \text{and} \qquad q, q_0 \text{ are arbitrary}$$

or

$$t_0 - \frac{d}{p_0} = t - \frac{d}{p} \qquad \text{and} \qquad q \le q_0 \,.$$

This result has a certain history. For the first time it has been proved by Taibleson in his series of papers [**29**]-[**31**], but see also [**35**, 2.7.1] and [**26**]. In case of the Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness the following is known. Again we suppose $0 < p \le p_0 \le \infty$. Then $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ holds if and only if either

$$t_0 - \frac{1}{p_0} < t - \frac{1}{p} \qquad \text{and} \qquad q, q_0 \text{ are arbitrary}$$

or

$$t_0 - \frac{1}{p_0} = t - \frac{1}{p} \qquad \text{and} \qquad q \le q_0 \,.$$

We refer to [**24**] and [**10**].

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Assuming $S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ Lemma 4.9 implies $p_0 \le p$. Next we apply Example 4 to derive some relations between p_0 and p. We choose $a_j := \delta_{j,\ell}$, $j = 1, ..., \ell$. Then it follows

$$\| f_\ell \,|B^t_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = C\, 2^{\ell(t+1-1/p)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \| f_\ell \,|S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = C 2^{\ell(t+1-1/p_0)} \,.$$

The assumed embedding implies

$$t + 1 - \frac{1}{p} \le t_0 + 1 - \frac{1}{p_0} \,.$$

In case $t-\frac{1}{p}=t_0-\frac{1}{p_0}$ we employ Example 4 again with $a_j:=2^{-j(t+1-1/p)}$, $j=1,\dots,\ell$. As a consequence of the embedding we derive $q_0\le q$. This implies

$$S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\,,$$

see the above comments to embeddings of Besov spaces. □

Proof of Theorem 3.10. Assuming $B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ Lemma 4.9 implies $p_0\le p$. Next we employ Example 5 where the $a_j:=\delta_{j,\ell}$, $j=1,\dots,\ell$. We obtain

$$\|\,f_\ell\,|S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|=C\,2^{\ell d(t+1-\frac{1}{p})}\qquad\text{and}\qquad\|\,f_\ell\,|B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|=C\,2^{\ell d(\frac{t_0}{d}+1-\frac{1}{p_0})}$$

with $C>0$ independent of ℓ. The embedding $B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ yields

$$d\Big(\frac{t_0}{d}+1-\frac{1}{p_0}\Big)\ge d\Big(t+1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\qquad\Longleftrightarrow\qquad t_0-\frac{d}{p_0}\ge dt-\frac{d}{p}\,.$$

Now, if $t_0-\frac{d}{p_0}=dt-\frac{d}{p}$, we apply Example 5, again with $a_j:=2^{-j(t_0+1-1/p_0)}$, to obtain $q_0\le q$. All together we conclude

$$B^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow B^{td}_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\,,$$

see the above comments on embeddings. □

Proof of Theorem 3.11. Assuming $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ Lemma 4.9 implies $p\le p_0$. Example 5 with $a_j:=\delta_{j,\ell}$, $j=1,\dots,\ell$, yields

$$\|\,f_\ell\,|S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|=C\,2^{\ell d(t_0+1-\frac{1}{p_0})}\qquad\text{and}\qquad\|\,f_\ell\,|B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|=C\,2^{\ell d(t+1-\frac{1}{p})}$$

with $C>0$ independent of ℓ. The embedding $B^{td}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies

$$d\Big(t_0+1-\frac{1}{p_0}\Big)\le d\Big(t+1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\qquad\Longleftrightarrow\qquad t_0-\frac{1}{p_0}\le t-\frac{1}{p}\,.$$

Working with Example 5 in the case $t_0-\frac{1}{p_0}=t-\frac{1}{p}$, choose $a_j:=2^{-j(t+1-1/p)}$, we obtain $q\le q_0$. Taking into account the above comments on embeddings we arrive at $S^t_{p,q}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow S^{t_0}_{p_0,q_0}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. □

References

[1] T.I. Amanov, *Spaces of differentiable functions with dominating mixed derivatives*, Nauka Kaz. SSR, Alma-Ata, 1976.

[2] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Academic Press, Boston, 1988.

[3] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation Spaces, an Introduction*, Springer, New York, 1976.

[4] A.P. Calderón, *Intermediate spaces and interpolation, the complex method*, Studia Math. **24** (1964), 113-190.

[5] R.A. DeVore, B. Jawerth and V. Popov, *Compression of wavelet decompositions*, Amer. J. Math. **114** (1992), 737-785.

[6] M. Frazier and B. Jawerth, *A discrete transform and decompositions of distribution spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **93** (1990), 34-170.

[7] M. Hansen, *Nonlinear approximation and function spaces of dominating mixed smoothness*, Phd thesis, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Jena, 2010.

[8] M. Hansen and W. Sickel, *Best m-term approximation and tensor products of Sobolev and Besov spaces – the case of non-compact embeddings*, East J. Approx. **16** (2010), 313-356.

[9] M. Hansen and W. Sickel, *Best m-term approximation and tensor products of Sobolev and Besov spaces – the case of compact embeddings*, Constr. Approx. **36** (2012), 1-51.

[10] M. Hansen and J. Vybiral, *The Jawerth-Franke embedding of spaces with dominating mixed smoothness*, Georgian Math. J. **16** (2009), no. 4, 667-682.

[11] B. Jawerth, M. Milman, *Weakly rearrangement invariant spaces and approximation by largest elements*, Contemporary Math. **445** (2007), 103-110.
[12] B. Jawerth, M. Milman, *Wavelets and best approximation in Besov spaces*, Isr. Math. Conf. Proc. **5** (1992), 107-112.
[13] N. Kalton, S. Mayboroda and M. Mitrea, *Interpolation of Hardy-Sobolev-Besov-Triebel-Lizorkin Spaces and Applications to Problems in Partial Differential Equations*, Contemp. Math. **445**, Amer. Math. Soc., 2007.
[14] P. I. Lizorkin, *Multipliers of Fourier integrals and bounds of convolution in spaces with mixed norms. Applications*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. Tom **34** (1970), No. 1, 225-256.
[15] P. I. Lizorkin, *On the theory of Fourier multipliers*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklova **173** (1986), 149-163.
[16] A. Lunardi, *Interpolation theory*. Lect. Notes, Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa, 2009.
[17] O. Mendez and M. Mitrea, *The Banach envelopes of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and applications to partial differential equations*, JFAA **6**(5) (2000), 503-531.
[18] S. M. Nikol'skij, *Approximation of Functions of Several Variables and Imbedding Theorems*, Springer, Berlin, 1975.
[19] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of multivariate problems. Volume I: Linear information*, EMS, Zürich, 2008.
[20] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of multivariate problems. Volume II: Standard information for functionals*, EMS, Zürich, 2010.
[21] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of multivariate problems. Volume III: Standard information for operators*, EMS, Zürich, 2012.
[22] J. Peetre, *New thoughts on Besov spaces*. Duke Univ. Press, Durham, 1976.
[23] H.-J. Schmeisser, *Recent developments in the theory of function spaces with dominating mixed smoothness*, in Proc. Conf. NAFSA-8, Prague 2006, (ed. J. Rakosnik), Inst. of Math. Acad. Sci., Czech Republic, Prague, 2007, pp. 145-204.
[24] H.-J. Schmeisser and W. Sickel, *Spaces of functions of mixed smoothness and their relations to approximation from hyperbolic crosses*, J. Approx. Theory **128** (2004), 115-150.
[25] H.-J. Schmeisser and H. Triebel, *Topics in Fourier analysis and function spaces*, Geest & Portig, Leipzig, 1987 and Wiley, Chichester, 1987.
[26] W. Sickel and H. Triebel, *Hölder inequalities and sharp embeddings in function spaces of $B^s_{p,q}$ and $F^s_{p,q}$ type*, Z. Anal. Anwendungen **14** (1995), 105-140.
[27] W. Sickel and T. Ullrich, *Tensor products of Sobolev-Besov spaces and applications to approximation from the hyperbolic cross*, J. Approx. Theory **161** (2009), 748–786.
[28] W. Sickel and T. Ullrich, *Spline interpolation on sparse grids*, Applicable Analysis **90** (2011), 337–383.
[29] M. H. Taibleson, *On the theory of Lipschitz spaces of distributions on Euclidean n-space. I. Principal properties*, J. Math. Mech. **13** (1964), 407-479.
[30] M. H. Taibleson, *On the theory of Lipschitz spaces of distributions on Euclidean n-space. II. Translation invariant operators, duality, and interpolation*, J. Math. Mech. **14** (1965), 821-839.
[31] M. H. Taibleson, *On the theory of Lipschitz spaces of distributions on Euclidean n-space. III. Smoothness and integrability of Fourier transforms, smoothness of convolution kernels*, J. Math. Mech. **15** (1966), 973-981.
[32] V. N. Temlyakov, *Approximation of periodic functions*, Nova Science, New York, 1993.
[33] H. Triebel, *Besov-Sobolev-Hardy spaces*, Teubner-Texte zur Math., Teubner, Leipzig, 1978.
[34] H. Triebel, *Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
[35] H. Triebel, *Theory of function spaces*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983.
[36] H. Triebel, *Theory of function spaces II*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1992.
[37] T. Ullrich, *Function spaces with dominating mixed smoothness. Characterizations by differences*, Jenaer Schriften zur Mathematik und Informatik Math/Inf/05/06, Jena, 2006.
[38] J. Vybiral, *Function spaces with dominating mixed smoothness*, Dissertationes Math. **436** (2006).
[39] W. Yuan, W. Sickel and D. Yang, *Interpolation of Morrey-Campanato and related smoothness spaces*, Science China Math. **58**(9) (2015), 1835-1908.

Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07737 Jena, Germany and University of Transport and Communications, Dong Da, Hanoi, Vietnam
E-mail address: kien.nguyen@uni-jena.de

Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07737 Jena, Germany
E-mail address: winfried.sickel@uni-jena.de